

**KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP**  
AND AFFILIATED PARTNERSHIPS

300 North LaSalle Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60654

Timothy A. Duffy, P.C.  
To Call Writer Directly:  
(312) 862-2445  
tim.duffy@kirkland.com

(312) 862-2000

[www.kirkland.com](http://www.kirkland.com)

Facsimile:  
(312) 862-2200

CHAMBERS OF  
JUDGE MARRERO

December 22, 2011

**VIA HAND DELIVERY**

Judge Victor Marrero  
United States District Court  
Southern District of New York  
500 Pearl Street  
New York, New York 10007

USDC SDNY  
DOCUMENT  
ELECTRONICALLY FILED  
DOC #: 12/23/11  
DATE FILED: 12/23/11

Re: *Anwar, et al. v. Fairfield Greenwich Limited, et al.*  
Master File No. 09-CV-00118 (VM) (THK)

Dear Judge Marrero:

I write on behalf of my client, PwC Canada, and defendants PwC Netherlands (“the PwC Defendants”), Citco Fund Services (Europe) B.V., Citco (Canada) Inc., Citco Global Custody N.V., Citco Bank Nederland N.V. Dublin Branch, Citco Fund Services (Bermuda) Limited, The Citco Group Limited (“the Citco Defendants”), and GlobeOp Financial Services, LLC (“GlobeOp”) (collectively, “the Service Provider Defendants”), regarding the defendants’ brief to be filed in opposition to plaintiffs’ pending motion for class certification, which is currently due on January 13, 2012.

On March 2, 2011, in connection with granting plaintiffs’ request to file a 40-page brief in support of their motion for class certification, the Court directed all defendants to file a single, consolidated omnibus submission in response. (Dkt. #610) Counsel for the nine Service Provider Defendants have been working diligently with counsel for the 27 entities and individuals affiliated with Fairfield Greenwich Ltd. (“the Fairfield Greenwich Defendants”) to comply with the Court’s request and present a single brief, not to exceed 40 pages, that covers all of the arguments against plaintiffs’ motion that have arisen out of the discovery undertaken by the parties over the past several months.

There remain, however, certain discrete class-certification issues, unique to each of the three groups of Service Provider Defendants, that we feel would be more efficiently presented to the Court in short supplemental briefs, not to exceed seven pages in length on behalf of each of the three groups of Service Provider Defendants. While we appreciate the Court’s concern for the economy of a single, consolidated brief, allowing short supplemental briefs will streamline

KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP

Judge Victor Marrero  
December 22, 2011  
Page 2

the main brief and allow the Court to review the various arguments that apply to only some of the defendants in a more organized fashion.

We have reviewed this request with counsel for the Fairfield Greenwich Defendants, who do not object to it. We have also reviewed it with counsel for plaintiffs. Plaintiffs do not oppose a reasonable extension of the number of pages of briefing allowed, provided their page limit on reply is extended by 50% of the extra pages granted to defendants. Plaintiffs do, however, believe that the defendants should nevertheless file a single, consolidated brief as indicated in the Court's March 2, 2011 Order.

We therefore respectfully request that the Court grant the PwC Defendants, the Citco Defendants, and GlobeOp permission to each file a supplemental brief in response to plaintiffs' motion for class certification not to exceed seven pages in length.

Very truly yours,



Timothy A. Duffy

cc: Counsel or Record (via e/mail)

Request GRANTED. The PwC  
Defendants, the Citco Defendants and  
The Globe Op Defendants are authorized  
to submit supplemental response  
briefs not to exceed seven pages in  
connection with the class certification motion.  
SO ORDERED:

12-27-11

DATE VICTOR MARRERO, U.S.D.J.

